arXiv:1002.1744v1 [cs.IT] 9 Feb 2010

On some invariants in numerical semigroups and estimations of the order bound.

Anna Oneto and Grazia Tamone

[1] **Abstract.** Let $S = \{s_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a numerical semigroup. For $s_i \in S$, let $\nu(s_i)$ denote the number of pairs $(s_i - s_j, s_j) \in S^2$. When S is the Weierstrass semigroup of a family $\{\mathcal{C}_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of one-point algebraic-geometric codes, a good bound for the minimum distance of the code $\mathcal{C}_i$ is the Feng and Rao *order bound* $d_{ORD}(C_i) := min\{\nu(s_j) :\ j \geq i+1\}$. It is well-known that there exists an integer m such that the sequence $\{\nu(s_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing for $s_i > s_m$, therefore $d_{ORD}(C_i) = \nu(s_{i+1})$ for $i \geq m$. By way of some suitable parameters related to the semigroup S, we find upper bounds for s_m, we evaluate s_m exactly in many cases, further we give a lower bound for several classes of semigroups.

Index Therms. Numerical semigroup, Weierstrass semigroup, AG code, order bound on the minimum distance, Cohen-Macaulay type.

1 Introduction

Let $S = \{s_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a numerical semigroup and let $e,\ c,\ c',\ d,\ d'$ denote respectively the multiplicity, the conductor, the subconductor, the dominant of the semigroup and the greatest element in S preceding c' (if $e > 1$), as in Setting 2.1. Further let ℓ be the number of gaps of S between d and c, and let
$$\widetilde{s} := max\{s \in S \ \ such\ that \ \ s \leq d \ \ and \ \ s - \ell \notin S\}.$$
When S is the Weierstrass semigroup of a family $\{\mathcal{C}_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of one-point AG codes (see [3],[2]), a good bound for the minimum distance of $\mathcal{C}_i$ is the Feng and Rao *order bound*
$$d_{ORD}(C_i) := min\{\nu(s_j) :\ j \geq i+1\}$$
where, for $s_j \in S$, $\nu(s_j)$ denotes the number of pairs $(s_j - s_k, s_k) \in S^2$ (see [2]). It is well-known that there exists an integer m such that sequence $\{\nu(s_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing for $i \geq m+1$ (see[7]) and so $d_{ORD}(C_i) = \nu(s_{i+1})$ for $i \geq m$. For this reason it is important to find the element s_m of S. In our papers [5] and [6], we proved that $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ if $\widetilde{s} \geq d'$, further we evaluated s_m for $\ell \leq 2,\ e \leq 6,$ *Cohen-Macaulay type* ≤ 3.

In this paper, by a more detailed study of the semigroup we find interesting relations among the integers defined above; further by using these relations we deduce the Feng and Rao order bound in several new situations. Moreover in every considered case we show that $s_m \geq c + d - e$.
In Section 2, we establish various formulas and inequalities among the integers $e,\ \ell,\ d',\ c',\ d,\ c$ and $t := d - \widetilde{s}$, see in particular (2.5) and (2.6). In Section 3, by using the results of Section 2 and some result from [6], we improve the known facts on s_m recalled above; further we state the conjecture that $c + d - e$ ia always a lower bound for s_m and we prove it in many cases. Finally (Section 4) we deduce some particular case by applying the previous results and by some direct trick.

In conclusion by glueing togheter some facts of [1], [5], [6] and the results of the present paper, we see that the value of the *order bound* s_m depends essentially on the position of the integer $\widetilde{s}$ in the semigroup. We summarize below the main results for the convenience of the reader.

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{If} \ \ \widetilde{s} \geq d' + c' - d & \text{then} & s_m = \widetilde{s} + d \\ \text{if} \ \ \widetilde{s} = 2d' - d & \text{then} & s_m = \widetilde{s} + d = 2d' \\ \text{if} \ \ \widetilde{s} \leq d' + c' - d - 1 & \text{then} & s_m \leq max\{\widetilde{s} + d, 2d'\}. \qquad (3.4) \end{array}$$

---

[1] The first author is with Diptem, Università di Genova, P.le Kennedy,
Pad. D - 16129 Genova (Italy) (*E-mail*: oneto@diptem.unige.it). The second author is with Dima, Università di Genova, Via Dodecaneso 35 - 16146 Genova (Italy) (*E-mail*: tamone@dima.unige.it).

$$\text{If} \quad [d'-\ell,d']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S \qquad \text{then} \quad \left[\begin{array}{ll} \widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+1\le s_m\le 2d' & if \ \ 2d'-d<\widetilde{s}<d'+c'-d \\ s_m=\widetilde{s}+d & otherwise. \qquad (3.11) \end{array}\right.$$

$$\text{If} \quad \left\{\begin{array}{l} \widetilde{s}\le d'-2 \\ \left[\ \widetilde{s}+2,d'\ \right]\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S \\ 2d'-d<\widetilde{s}<d'+c'-d \end{array}\right. \qquad \text{then} \quad \left[\begin{array}{ll} s_m=\widetilde{s}+d & \iff \ \widetilde{s}+1\notin S \text{ and } c'=d \\ s_m\le\widetilde{s}+d-1 & otherwise. \qquad (3.8) \end{array}\right.$$

$$\text{If} \quad \left\{\begin{array}{l} \widetilde{s}\le 2d'-d \\ \left[\ \widetilde{s}+2,d'\ \right]\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S \end{array}\right. \qquad \text{then} \quad s_m=\widetilde{s}+d. \qquad (3.8)$$

Further, if H denotes the subset of gaps of S inside the interval $[c-e,c'-1]$ and τ is the Cohen-Macaulay type of S, the exact value or good estimations for s_m are given in the following cases.

If $H=\emptyset$, then $s_m=\widetilde{s}+d$ (4.1)

If H *is a non empty interval*, then $s_m=\left[\begin{array}{ll} 2d' & if \ \ \widetilde{s}\ge 2d'+1-d \\ \widetilde{s}+d & otherwise \quad (4.1) \end{array}\right.$

If S *is associated to a Suzuki curve*, then $s_m=\widetilde{s}+d$ (4.14).

If $\#H\le 2$, see (4.4).

If $\ell\le 3$, see (4.5), (4.7).

If $\tau\le 7$, see (4.10).

If $e\le 8$, see (4.11).

If S *is generated by an Almost Arithmetic Sequence and embdim*$(S)\le 5$, see (4.12).

2 Semigroups: invariants and relations.

We begin by giving the setting of the paper.

Setting 2.1 In all the article we shall use the following notation. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of all non-negative integers. A *numerical semigroup* is a subset S of $\mathbb{N}$ containing 0, closed under summation and with finite complement in $\mathbb{N}$; we shall always assume $S\neq\mathbb{N}$. We denote the elements of S by $\{s_i\}$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$, with $s_0=0<s_1<...<s_i<s_{i+1}....$
We set $S(1):=\{b\in\mathbb{N}\mid\ b+(S\setminus\{0\})\subseteq S\}$

We list below the invariants related to a semigroup $S\subset\mathbb{N}$ we shall need in the sequel.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
e & := & s_1>1, \text{ the } \textit{multiplicity} \text{ of } S. \\
c & := & min\ \{r\in S\mid r+\mathbb{N}\subseteq S\}, \text{ the } \textit{conductor} \text{ of } S \\
d & := & \text{the greatest element in } S \text{ preceding } c, \textit{ the dominant} \text{ of } S \\
c' & := & max\{s_i\in S\mid s_i\le d\ \ and\ \ s_i-1\notin S\}, \text{ the } \textit{subconductor} \text{ of } S \\
d' & := & \text{the greatest element in S preceding } c', \text{ when } \ c'>0 \\
k & := & d-c' \\
q & := & d-d' \\
\ell & := & c-1-d, \text{ the number of gaps of } S \text{ greater than } d \\
g & := & \#(\mathbb{N}\setminus S), \text{ the } \textit{genus} \text{ of } S\ (=\text{the number of gaps of } S) \\
\tau & := & \#(S(1)\setminus S), \text{ the } Cohen{-}Macaulay\ \textit{type} \text{ of } S
\end{array}$$

Since $c-e-1\notin S$ we have $c-e\le c'$; we define the following sets

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
H & := & [c-e,c']\cap\mathbb{N}\setminus S \quad \subseteq\mathbb{N}\setminus S \\
S' & := & \{s\in S\mid s\le d'\}\subseteq S.
\end{array}$$

Further we shall describe any semigroup S with $c' > 0$ as follows:

$$S=\{0,*\ldots*,\ e,\ \ldots,\ d',*\ldots*,\ c'\ \longleftrightarrow\ \overset{\ell\ \text{gaps}}{d,*\ldots*,}\ c\rightarrow\}=S'\cup\{\ c'\ \longleftrightarrow\ d,*\ldots*,\ c\rightarrow\},$$

where "$*$" indicates *gaps*, "$*\ \ldots\ *$" *interval of all gaps*, and "$\longleftrightarrow$" *intervals without gaps.*

Moreover for $s_i \in S$ we fix the following notation.

$$\begin{array}{lcll lcl}
N(s_i) & := & \{(s_j,s_k)\in S^2 \mid s_i=s_j+s_k\}; & & \nu(s_i) & := & \#N(s_i), \\
 & & & & \eta(s_i) & := & \nu(s_{i+i})-\nu(s_i). \\
d_{ORD}(i) & := & min\{\nu(s_j)\mid j>i\},\ \text{the } \textit{order bound.} & & & & \\
A\,(s_i) & := & \{(x,y),(y,x)\in N(s_i)\mid x<c',\ c'\le y\le d\}; & & \alpha(s_i) & := & \#A(s_{i+1})-\#A(s_i). \\
B\,(s_i) & := & \{(x,y)\in N(s_i)\mid (x,y)\in[c',d]^2\ \}; & & \beta(s_i) & := & \#B(s_{i+1})-\#B(s_i). \\
C\,(s_i) & := & \{(x,y)\in S'^2\cap N(s_i)\}; & & \gamma(s_i) & := & \#C(s_{i+1})-\#C(s_i). \\
D\,(s_i) & := & \{(x,y),\ (y,x)\in N(s_i)\mid\ x\ge c\}; & & \delta(s_i) & := & \#D(s_{i+1})-\#D(s_i).
\end{array}$$

Now we recall some definition and former results for completeness. First, a semigroup S is called

$$\begin{array}{lll}
ordinary & if & S=\{0\}\cup\{n\in\mathbb{N},\ n\ge c\} \\
acute & if & either\ S\ is\ ordinary,\ or\ \ c,d,c',d'\ \ satisfy\ \ c-d\le c'-d'\quad [1,\text{Def. } 5.6].
\end{array}$$

Definition 2.2 *We define the invariants* $\widetilde{s}$, m *and* t *as follows.*

$\widetilde{s}\ :=\ max\ \{s\in S\ such\ that\ \ s-\ell\notin S\}.$

$t\ :=\ d-\widetilde{s}.$

$m :=\ min\ \{j\in\mathbb{N}\ such\ that\ the\ sequence\ \{\nu(s_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\ is\ non\text{-}decreasing\ for\ i>j\}$

$(m>0\iff\nu(s_m)>\nu(s_{m+1})\ and\ \nu(s_{m+k})\le\nu(s_{m+k+1}),\ \ for\ each\ k\ge 1).$

Theorem 2.3 *Let* $S=\{s_i\}_{\,i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be as in Setting 2.1.*

(1) $\nu(s_i)=i+1-g,\quad for\ every\ \ s_i\ge 2c-1.$ [7, Th. 3.8]

(2) $\nu(s_{i+1})\ge\nu(s_i),\quad for\ every\ s_i\ge 2d+1.$ [5, Prop. 3.9.1]

(3) *If* S *is an ordinary semigroup, then* $m=0$. [1, Th. 7.3]

(4) *If* $\widetilde{s}\ge d'$, *then* $s_m=\widetilde{s}+d$ [6, Th. 4.1, Th.4.2].

In particular:

  (a) *if* $t\le 2$, *then* $s_m=\widetilde{s}+d$,

  (b) *if* S *is an acute semigroup, then* $s_m=\widetilde{s}+d$, *with*

    i. either $d-c'\ge\ell-1,\ \ s_m=c+c'-2=\widetilde{s}+d,$

    ii. or $\widetilde{s}=d\ \ (s_m=2d).$ [5, Prop. 3.4] .

(5) *If* $c'\in\{c-e,c-e+1\}$, *then* S *is acute.* [6, Lemma 5.1].

Remark 2.4 (1) By the definition of $\widetilde{s}$ it is clear that:

$$s-\ell\in S\quad for\ each\quad s\in S\quad such\ that\ \ \widetilde{s}<s\le d.$$

(2). Theorem 2.3 implies that $0<s_m\le 2d$ for every non-ordinary semigroup.
(3) The condition (a) of (2.3.4) does not imply S acute: see (2.5.2). Analogously there exist non-acute semigroups satisfying the conditions ($4.b, i-ii$), as shown in Example 2.9.2.

We complete this section with some general relation among the invariants defined above.

Proposition 2.5 [6, Prop. 2.5] *Let* $c' = c - e + q, \;\; \textit{with } q \geq 0.$ *Then*

(1) $e \leq 2\ell + t + q.$

(2) *The following conditions*

  - (a) $d - c' \geq \ell - 1 \quad ($ *i.e.* $\; c + c' - 2 \leq 2d).$
  - (b) $\widetilde{s} - \ell = c' - 1.$
  - (c) $c + c' - 2 = \widetilde{s} + d.$
  - (d) $e = 2\ell + t + q$

    are equivalent and imply

    - (i) $c' \leq \widetilde{s} \leq d \qquad (\implies s_m = \widetilde{s} + d).$
    - (ii) S *is acute* $\iff d - d' \geq 2\ell + t.$

Proof. (1) By (2.2.1) we have $\widetilde{s} - \ell \leq c' - 1 = c - e + q - 1$, then $\widetilde{s} - \ell \leq d + \ell - e + q$ and so $e \leq 2\ell + t + q$.
(2) The equivalences $(2.a) \iff (2.b) \iff (2.c)$ are proved in [6, Prop. 2.5]. Clearly the equality $e = 2\ell + t + q$ holds if and only if $\widetilde{s} - \ell = d - t - \ell = c' - 1$. Further:
(i) is obvious by $(2.b)$.
(ii) If $(2.b)$ holds, then $d - d' - (2\ell + t) = \widetilde{s} - \ell - d' - \ell = (c' - d') - (\ell + 1) = (c' - d') - (c - d)$. Then S is acute $\iff d - d' \geq 2\ell + t$.

Proposition 2.6 *The following facts hold.*

(1) (a) *If* $\; 0 \leq h < e$ *and* $d - h \in S$, *then* $\; e \geq h + \ell + 1.$
  (b) *If* $\; s, s' \in S, \quad s \geq c - e, \quad s - \ell \leq s' < s$, *then* $\quad s' \geq c - e.$

(2) $\widetilde{s} \geq c - e \quad$ (*equivalently,* $\quad e \geq t + \ell + 1$).

(3) *Let* $t > 0$ *and let* $\; s' := min\{s \in S \mid s > \widetilde{s}\}$. *Then*

$e \geq 2\ell + 1 + d - s' \geq 2\ell + 1 \quad$ (*equivalently,* $s' \geq c - e + \ell$).

In particular, $\widetilde{s} + 1 \in S \implies e \geq 2\ell + t.$

(4) *One of the following conditions hold*

  - (a) $\widetilde{s} - \ell > c - e - 1 \quad$ (*equivalently* $\; e > 2\ell + t$, *equivalently* $\; \widetilde{s} - \ell \in H$)
  - (b) $\widetilde{s} - \ell = c - e - 1 \quad$ (*equivalently* $\; e = 2\ell + t$)
  - (c) $c - e - \ell \leq \widetilde{s} - \ell < c - e - 1 \quad$ (*equavalently* $\; e < 2\ell + t$)

(5) *Assume* $\; e < 2\ell + t$, *then* :

  - (a) *either* $\; \widetilde{s} \leq d'$, $\;$ *or* $\; t = 0.$
  - (b) *in case* $\; \widetilde{s} \leq d'$ $\;$ *we have:* $[\widetilde{s} + 1, c - e + \ell - 1] \cap S = \emptyset, \qquad \#H \; \geq 2\ell + t - e > 0.$

Proof. $(1.a)$ We have $d < d - h + e \in S$. Hence $d - h + e \geq c = d + \ell + 1$.
$(1.b)$ If $s \geq c$ we get $s' \geq c$. If $s \leq d$, let $s' = d - k, \; s = d - h \geq c - e$ (hence $h \leq e - \ell - 1$), then $d - \ell - h \leq d - k \implies k \leq h + \ell \leq e - 1$. Now apply (a).
(2) Let $d = c - e + h\ell + r$, with $h \geq 0, \; 0 \leq r < \ell$ (recall that $c - e \leq d$). If $\widetilde{s} < c - e$, first note that by (2.4.1) we get $d - h\ell \in S, \; d - (h+1)\ell \in S$; further we get $c - e - \ell \leq d - (h+1)\ell < c - e$, a contradiction because $[c - \ell - e, c - e - 1] \cap S = \emptyset$ for every semigroup.
(3) By (2.4.1), $\widetilde{s} < s' \leq d \implies s' - \ell \in S$ and so $s' - \ell + e \in S$. Since $c - e \leq \widetilde{s} < s'$, we get $s' - \ell + e > c - \ell = d + 1$; it follows that $\; s' - \ell + e \geq c$.
(4) Since $c - e - 1 \notin S$, the statements are almost immediate by (2).
(5) In case $e < 2\ell + t$, by (3) we have $\widetilde{s} + 1 \notin S$, therefore we have $\widetilde{s} \notin [c', d)$, hence $(5.a)$ holds.
$(5.b)$ Since $\widetilde{s} \geq c - e$ (2), we get $[\widetilde{s} - \ell + 1, c - e - 1] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq [c - \ell - e + 1, c - e - 1] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus S$. We deduce $[\widetilde{s} + 1, c - e + \ell - 1] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq H$ by (2.4.1). $\quad \diamond$

Corollary 2.7 *Assume* $\widetilde{s} < d$ *(i.e.* $t > 0$*). Then*

(1) *If* $\widetilde{s} \leq d'$, *then* $d - c' \leq \ell - 2, \;\; d - d' \leq \ell, \;\; c' \geq c - e + 2$.

(2) *Let* $c' = c - e + q$, *with* $q \in \{0, 1\}$; *then* $d - c' \geq \ell - 1$ *and* $e = 2\ell + t + q$.

(3) *If* $d - c' \leq \ell - 2$, *then*

  (*a*) $d - c' + 2 \leq \; d - d' \leq \ell \leq e - 3 - (d - c')$.

  (*b*) *If* $\widetilde{s} \geq 2d' - d$, *then* $t \leq 2\ell$.

(4) *If* $\widetilde{s} < d'$ *and* $e \leq 2\ell + t$, *then* $\#H \leq \ell + t - 2(d - c') - 4$.

Proof. (1) By (2.5.2) we see that $\widetilde{s} \leq d' \Longrightarrow d - c' \leq \ell - 2$ and also $d - d' \leq \ell$. Further $c' \geq c - e + 2$ because $c - e \leq \widetilde{s}$ (2.6.2) and $\widetilde{s} \leq d' \leq c' - 2$.
(2) By the assumptions and by (5), (4) of Theorem 2.3, we have $d - c' \geq \ell - 1$. Then the other statement follows by (2.5.2).
(3.a) Since $d' \leq c' - 2$ the first inequality holds for any semigroup. We have $d - c' \leq \ell - 2$, by assumption, and $d - \ell \in S$, by (2.4.1). Hence $d' \geq d - \ell$. For the last inequality see [6, Prop. 5.2]].
(3.b) follows by (3.a) because the assumption means $t \leq 2d - 2d'$.
(4) By (2.5.2) we have $d - c' \leq \ell - 2$, then by)2.6.1-2) and (3a), we deduce that $\{c' - \ell, ... d - \ell, \widetilde{s}, d'\} \subset S \cap [c - e, d']$. Hence $\#H \leq c' - (c - e) - 2 - (d - c' + 1) = 2c' - 2d - \ell - 1 - 3 + e \leq \; 2c' - 2d - \ell - 1 - 3 + 2\ell + t = \ell + t - 2(d - c') - 4$. ◇

Corollary 2.8 (1) *If* $c' \leq \widetilde{s} < d$, *then* $e \geq 2\ell + t$.

(2) *If* $\widetilde{s} \leq d'$, *we have:*

  (*a*) *If* $e \leq 2\ell + t$, *then* $d + 2\ell - e \in S \Longleftrightarrow e = 2\ell + t$.

  (*b*) *If* $H \subseteq [d' - t + 1, c' - 1]$, *then* $e \leq 2\ell + t$.

  (*c*) *If* $H = [d' + 1, c' - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}$ *and* $e < 2\ell + t$, *then* $\widetilde{s} = d'$.

Proof. (1) is immediate by (2.6.3) because $\widetilde{s} + 1 \in S$.
(2.a) Clearly $e = 2\ell + t \Longrightarrow d + 2\ell - e = \widetilde{s} \in S$. The converse follows by the assumption and by(2.6.5b): $c - e + \ell - 1 = d + 2\ell - e \in S \Longrightarrow e \geq 2\ell + t$; then $e = 2\ell + t$.
(2.b) $\widetilde{s} \leq d' \Longrightarrow d - \ell \in S \Longrightarrow d - \ell \leq d'$ by (2.7.1). Hence $\widetilde{s} - \ell \leq d' - t$: now the assumption on H implies $\widetilde{s} - \ell \notin H$, i.e., $e \leq 2\ell + t$ (2.64).
(2.c) If $e < 2\ell + t$, we have $\widetilde{s} + 1 \notin S$ (2.6.3); since $c - e < \widetilde{s} + 1$ we get $\widetilde{s} + 1 \in H$, and so $\widetilde{s} = d'$. ◇

Example 2.9 (1) If $t > 0$, for each s_i such that $\widetilde{s} < s_i \leq d$, we have that $s_i - \ell \in S$, hence $s_i - s_{i-1} \leq \ell$, but it is not true that for each $s_i \in S$ such that $c - e \leq s_i < d$, we have $s_{i+1} - s_i \leq \ell$: for instance let $S = \{0, 5\ell_e, 7\ell_{\widetilde{s} = d - \ell = d'}, \; 8\ell_d, \; 9\ell + 1_c \rightarrow\}$.

(2) When $t = 0$ the inequality $e \geq 2\ell + 1$ (proved in (2.6.3) for $t > 0$) in general is not true, even for acute semigroups:

$S_1 = \{0, \; 10_{e=d'}, \; 17_{c'}, 18, \; 19, \; 20_d, \; 27_c \rightarrow\}$:

$\ell = 6, \; t = 0$, S_1 is acute with $d - c' \leq \ell - 2, \; e < 2\ell$.

$S_2 = \{0, \; 8_e, \; 12_{d'}, \; 14_{c'}, \; 15, \; 16_d, \; 20_c \rightarrow\}$:

$\ell = 3, \; t = 0$, S_2 is non-acute with $d - c' = \ell - 1, \;\; e > 2\ell$.

$S_3 = \{0, \; 7_e, \; 12_{d'}, \; 14_{c'=d}, \; 19_c \rightarrow\}$:

$\ell = 4, \; t = 0$, S_3 is non-acute with $d - c' \leq \ell - 2, \;\; e < 2\ell$.

$S_4 = \{0, \; 10_{e=d'}, \; 14_d, \; 20_c \rightarrow\}$

$\ell = 5, \; t = 0$, S_4 is non-acute with $d - c' \leq \ell - 2, \; e = 2\ell$.

(3) When $\widetilde{s} \leq d'$ we can have every case $(a), (b), (c)$ of (2.6.4):

$S_5 = \{0,\ 13_e,\ 15_{d'}, 20d,\ 26_c \rightarrow\} : \ell = t = 5 \ \ e < 2\ell + t = 15;$

$S_6 = \{0,\ 15_e,\ 19_{d'=\widetilde{s}}, 24d,\ 30_c \rightarrow\} : \ell = t = 5 \ \ e = 2\ell + t = 15;$

$S_7 = \{0, 26_e,\ 28, 31_{d'}, 33_d,\ 39_c \rightarrow\} : \ell = t = 5 \ \ e > 2\ell + t = 15.$

3 General results on s_m.

We saw in [6], that $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$, when $\widetilde{s} \geq d'$. To give estimations of s_m in the remaining cases we shall use the same tools as in [6]: we recall them for the convenience of the reader and we add some improvement, as the general inequalities (3.1.3) on the difference $\nu(s+1) - \nu(s)$. Therefore great part of the following (3.1),(3.3),(3.4) is already proved in [6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3].

Proposition 3.1 *Let* $S' = \{s \in S,\ \mid s \leq d'\}$. *For* $s_i \in S$, *let* $\eta(s_i),\ \alpha(s_i),\ \beta(s_i),\ \gamma(s_i),\ \delta(s_i)$ *be as in* (2.1). *Then:*

(1) *If* $\widetilde{s} < d'$, *we have:*
$s_{i+1} = s_i + 1$ *for* $s_i \geq \widetilde{s} + d' - \ell$, *in particular for* $s_i \geq 2d'$.

(2) *For each* $s_i \in S:$ $\eta(s_i) = \alpha(s_i) + \beta(s_i) + \gamma(s_i) + \delta(s_i)$. *Further*

$$\alpha(s_i) = \left[\begin{array}{rll} -2 & if & (s_{i+1} - c' \notin S' \ and \ \ s_i - d \in S') \\ 0 & if & (s_{i+1} - c' \in S' \iff s_i - d \in S') \\ 2 & if & (s_{i+1} - c' \in S' \ and \ \ s_i - d \notin S'). \end{array}\right.$$

$$\beta(s_i) = \left[\begin{array}{rll} 0 & if & s_i \leq 2c' - 2 \ \ or \ \ s_i > 2d \\ 1 & if & 2c' - 1 \leq s_i \leq c' + d - 1 \\ -1 & if & c' + d \leq s_i \leq 2d. \end{array}\right.$$

$$\gamma(s_i) = \left[\begin{array}{rll} 0 & if & s_i \geq 2d' + 1 \\ -1 & if & s_i = 2d' \\ -1 & if & s_i < 2d' \ \ and \ \ [s_i - d', d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S. \end{array}\right.$$

$$\delta(s_i) = \left[\begin{array}{lll} 0 & if & s_{i+1} - c \notin S, \ \ s_i \leq 2c - 1 \\ 2 & if & s_{i+1} - c \in S, \ s_i \leq 2c - 1 \\ 1 & if & s_i \geq 2c\ . \end{array}\right.$$

(3) *Let* $s = 2d - k < 2d$ *and* $s + 1 \in S$, *then*:

$$(a) \ \ -\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

$$(b) \ \ If \ \ s = 2d' - h < 2d', \ then \ \ \ -\left[\frac{h}{2}\right] - 1 \leq \gamma(s) \leq \left[\frac{h+1}{2}\right].$$

Proof. (1) By assumption and by (2.6.2) we have $c - e \leq \widetilde{s} < d'$ and so $d' - \ell \in S$. It follows $d' - \ell \geq e$ because $d' \geq e \geq \ell + t + 1$ (2.6.2). Hence $s \geq \widetilde{s} + d' - \ell \Longrightarrow s \geq c$.
(2) By [6, (3.3)...(3.7)] we have only to prove the last two statements for γ. Let $s = 2d' - h \in S,\ h \in \mathbb{N},\ s + 1 = 2d' - h + 1$ and assume $[d' - h, d'] = [s_i - d', d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$. Then: $C(s_i) =$
$\{(d' - h, d'), (d' - h + 1, d' - 1), (d' - h + 2, d' - 2), ..., (d' - 1, d' - h + 1), (d', d' - h)\}$
$C(s_{i+1}) = \{(d' - h + 1, d'), (d' - h + 2, d' - 1), .., (d' - 1, d' - h + 2), (d', d' - h + 1)\}$
it follows that $\gamma(s_i) = \#C(s_{i+1}) - \#C(s_i) = h - (h + 1) = -1$.
(3.a) To prove the inequalities for $s = 2d - k$, divide the interval $[d - [k/2], d] \cap \mathbb{N}$ in subsets

$$\Lambda_j := H_j \cup S_j, \quad j = 1, ..., j(s), \text{ with } H_j \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus S,\ S_j \subseteq S, \quad S_j = [a_j, b_j] \cap \mathbb{N} \ \text{ interval}$$

such that $b_j + 1 \notin S$ and $H_j \neq \emptyset$, if $j > 1$ (i.e. $a_{j-1} \notin S$ for $j > 1$, $H_1 = \emptyset \iff a_1 = d - [k/2] \in S$).
Hence

$$\Lambda_j = [* * * \ a_j \longleftrightarrow b_j].$$

Let $N(s)_j := N(s) \cap \{(x,y),(y,x) \mid y \in S_j\}$: we have $N(s) = \bigcup_j N(s)_j \cup D(s)$. Hence:

$$\nu(s+1) - \nu(s) = \left(\textstyle\sum_j n_j\right) + \delta(s), \text{ where } n_j = \#N(s+1)_j - \#N(s)_j.$$

Further: $-2 \leq n_j \leq 2$. This fact follows by the same argument used to prove the formulas for $\alpha(s_i)$, $\beta(s_i)$ recalled in statement (2) above. Since $0 \leq \delta(s) \leq 2$ (see (2) above) we conclude that

$$(*) \qquad -2j(s) \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2j(s) + 2.$$

More precisely, to evaluate the largest and lowest possible values of $\nu(s+1) - \nu(s)$, with $s = 2d - k$, we consider separately four cases:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} (A) & k = 4p \\ (B) & k = 4p+1 \\ (C) & k = 4p+2 \\ (D) & k = 4p+3. \end{array}\right.$$

In each case we can see that $j(s) \leq p + 1 = \left[\dfrac{k}{4}\right] + 1$. First note that $d \in S$, hence $j(s)$ is maximal when $\#H_j = \#S_j = 1$, i.e. $[d - \left[\dfrac{k}{2}\right], d] = [\ldots * \times * \times \ldots * d]$ (where × means element$\in S$).

In each of the above cases we shall find integers x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 such that $\begin{cases} x_1 \leq \nu(s+1) \leq x_2 \\ y_1 \leq \nu(s) \leq y_2 \end{cases}$, then the statement will follow by the obvious inequality $x_1 - y_2 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq x_2 - y_1$.

- If either $k = 4p$, or $k = 4p+1$, then $j(s)$ is maximal if and only if

$$[d - \left[\frac{k}{2}\right], d] = [d - 2p * \ldots * d - 2 * d], \text{ with } j(s) = p + 1.$$

Note that when $j(s) = p+1$, then $1 \leq \#\big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+1$ because $(d-2p, d-2p) \in N(s)$; further we have $p \leq j(s+1) \leq p+1$ and so $0 \leq \#N(s+1) \leq 2p+4$.

If $k = 4p$, we have $1 \leq \#\big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+1$, since $(d-2p, d-2p) \in N(s)$, further $j(s+1) = p$, hence $0 \leq \#\big(N(s+1) \setminus D(s+1)\big) \leq 2p$.

$$-\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 = -2p - 1 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2p + 2 - 1 < \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

If $k = 4p+1$, we have $0 \leq \#\big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+2$, further $s + 1 = 2d - 4p$, therefore $1 \leq \#\big(N(s+1) \setminus D(s+1)\big) \leq 2p+1$. We obtain:

$$-\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 = -2p - 1 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2p + 3 = \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

- If either $k = 4p+2$, or $k = 4p+3$, then $\left[\dfrac{k}{2}\right] = 2p+1$,

analogously we get $j(s) = p+1$ maximal if

$$\left[d - \left[\frac{k}{2}\right], d\right] = \left[\begin{array}{l} [\, * d - 2p * \ldots * d - 2 * d] \quad \mathit{or} \\ [\, d - 2p - 1 \ldots * \times \times * \ldots d] \text{ (with one and only one } j_0 \text{ such that } \#S_{j_0} = 2). \end{array}\right.$$

If $k = 4p+2$, in the first subcase we get $0 \leq \big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+2$, and $0 \leq \#\big(N(s+1) \setminus D(s+1)\big) \leq 2p$ because $(d-2p-1, d-2p) \notin N(s+1)$. Hence

$$-\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 = -2p - 2 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2p + 2 < \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

In the second subcase we get $1 \leq \#\big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+2$, because $(d-2p-1, d-2p-1) \in N(s)$ and $0 \leq \big(N(s+1) \setminus D(s+1)\big) \leq 2p$ since $(d-2p-1, d-2p) \notin N(s+1)$. Hence

$$-\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 = -2p - 2 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2p + 1 < \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

If $k = 4p+3$, in the first subcase we get $0 \leq \big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+2$, and $0 \leq \#\big(N(s+1) \setminus D(s+1)\big) \leq 2p+2$ because $(d-2p-1, d-2p) \notin N(s+1)$. Hence

$$-\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 = -2p - 2 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2p + 4 = \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

In the second subcase we get $0 \leq \#\big(N(s) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+2$ and $0 \leq \#\big(N(s+1) \setminus D(s)\big) \leq 2p+1$ because $(d-2p-1, d-2p-1) \in N(s+1)$. Hence

$$-\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1 = -2p-2 \leq \nu(s+1) - \nu(s) \leq 2p+3 < \left[\frac{k+5}{2}\right].$$

(3.b) The proof is quite similar to the above one: since $\gamma(s) = \#C(s+1) - \#C(s)$, we do not need to add $\delta(s)$ and so formula $(*)$ becomes

$$-2j'(s) \leq \gamma(s) \leq 2j'(s),$$

where $j'(s)$ is the number of subset Λ_j as in (3.a) contained in the interval $[d' - \left[\frac{h}{2}\right], d'] \cap \mathbb{N}$. Then it suffices to proceed as above. ◇

Example 3.2 The bounds found in (3.1.3a) are both sharp. To see this fact, consider $S = \{0, 10_e, 20_{d'}, 30_d, 40_c \rightarrow\}$ an the elements $s = 2d-1 = 59$, $s+1 = 2d = 60$. By a direct computation we easily get: $\nu(s+1) - \nu(s) = 3 = \left[\frac{k+1}{2}\right] + 2$ (with $k=1$), and $\nu(s+2) - \nu(s+1) = -\left[\frac{k}{2}\right] - 1$ (with $k=0$).

Proposition 3.3 *Let* $\bigcirc$ *mean* $\notin S'$ *and* $\times$ *mean* $\in S'$ *(recall that for* $s \leq d'$*, we have* $s \in S \iff s \in S'$*). The following tables describe the difference* $\eta(s_i) = \nu(s_{i+1}) - \nu(s_i)$ *for* $s_i \in S$, $s_i < 2c$ *in function of* $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$.

(a) *If* $s_i < 2c$ *:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccccc}
s_{i+1}-c & s_i - d & s_{i+1}-c' & \alpha & \delta & \eta(s_i) \\
\notin S & \times & \bigcirc & -2 & 0 & \beta+\gamma-2 \\
\notin S & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & 0 & 0 & \beta+\gamma \\
\notin S & \times & \times & 0 & 0 & \beta+\gamma \\
\notin S & \bigcirc & \times & 2 & 0 & \beta+\gamma+2 \\
\in S & \times & \bigcirc & -2 & 2 & \beta+\gamma \\
\in S & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & 0 & 2 & \beta+\gamma+2 \\
\in S & \times & \times & 0 & 2 & \beta+\gamma+2 \\
\in S & \bigcirc & \times & 2 & 2 & \beta+\gamma+4
\end{array}\right].$$

More precisely we have the following subcases.

(b) *If* $s_i \leq 2d'-1$*, then* $\beta = 0$*:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccccccc}
s_{i+1}-c & s_i - d & s_{i+1}-c' & \alpha & \beta & \delta & \eta(s_i) \\
\bigcirc & \times & \bigcirc & -2 & 0 & 0 & \gamma-2 \\
\bigcirc & \times & \times & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma \\
\bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma \\
\times & \times & \bigcirc & -2 & 0 & 2 & \gamma \\
\bigcirc & \bigcirc & \times & 2 & 0 & 0 & \gamma+2 \\
\times & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & 0 & 0 & 2 & \gamma+2 \\
\times & \times & \times & 0 & 0 & 2 & \gamma+2 \\
\times & \bigcirc & \times & 2 & 0 & 2 & \gamma+4
\end{array}\right].$$

(c) *If* $s_i = 2d'$*, then* $\beta = 0$, $\gamma = -1$*:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccccccc} s_{i+1}-c & s_i-d & s_{i+1}-c' & \alpha & \beta & \delta & \eta(s_i) \\ \bigcirc & \times & \bigcirc & -2 & 0 & 0 & -3 \\ \bigcirc & \times & \times & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \times & \times & \bigcirc & -2 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\ \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \times & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \times & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ \times & \times & \times & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ \times & \bigcirc & \times & 2 & 0 & 2 & 3 \end{array}\right].$$

(*d*) *If* $s_i \in [2d'+1, c'+d-1]$, *then* $\beta \in \{0,1\}$, $\gamma = 0$*:*
$\nu(s_{i+1}) < \nu(s_i)$ *if and only if the following row is satisfied*

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc} s_{i+1}-c & s_i-d & s_{i+1}-c' \\ \bigcirc & \times & \bigcirc \end{array}\right].$$

(*e*) *If* $s_i \in [c'+d, 2d]$, *then* $\beta = -1$, $\gamma = 0$, $s_i - d \in S \setminus S', s_{i+1} - c' \notin S'$, *then* $\nu(s_{i+1}) < \nu(s_i) \iff s_i - \ell - d \notin S$.

The next theorem collects with some upgrades the results [6, Th. 4.1, Th.4.2, Th. 4.4]: statement (1) improves [6, Th.4.2], the last part of (5) is new.

Theorem 3.4 *With Setting 2.1, the following inequalities hold.*

(0) *If* $\widetilde{s} \geq 2d' - d$, *then* $s_m \leq \widetilde{s} + d$; *if* $\widetilde{s} < 2d' - d$, *then* $s_m \leq 2d'$.

More precisely

(1) *If* $\widetilde{s} \geq d' + c' - d$, *then* $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$.

(2) *If* $\widetilde{s} = d' + c' - d - 1$, *then* $s_m \leq \widetilde{s} + d - 1$.

(3) *If* $2d' - d < \widetilde{s} < d' + c' - d - 1$, *let*

$U := \{\sigma \in [2d' + 1 - d, \ \widetilde{s}] \cap S \ \mid \ \sigma - \ell \notin S, \ \sigma + d + 1 - c' \notin S\}$*:*

- (*a*) *if* $U \neq \emptyset$, *then* $s_m = d + max\ U$,
  in particular $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d \iff \widetilde{s} + d + 1 - c' \notin S$,
- (*b*) *if* $U = \emptyset$, *then* $s_m \leq 2d'$.

(4) *If* $\widetilde{s} = 2d' - d$, *then* $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$.

(5) *If* $\widetilde{s} < 2d' - d$, *then* $s_m \leq 2d'$, *more precisely:*

$s_m = 2d' \iff 2d'$ *satisfies either row 3 or row 4 of Table 3.3 (c).*

In the case $\widetilde{s} + d + 1 - c' \notin S$:

- (*a*) *if* $2d' - d - 2 \leq \widetilde{s} \leq 2d' - d - 1$, *then* $\widetilde{s} + d \leq s_m \leq 2d'$
- (*b*) *if* $\widetilde{s} = 2d' - d - j$, $j = 3, 4$ *and* $\{d' - j, ..., d' - 1\} \cap S \neq \{d' - j + 1\}$ *then* $s_m \geq \widetilde{s} + d$.

Proof. (0) is proved in [6, (4.4.1),(4.4.3)].
Now recall that $\widetilde{s} \geq c - e$ (2.6.2), hence $\widetilde{s} + d + 1 \geq c + 1 \in S$; further in cases (1) and (2) $\widetilde{s} + d + 1 - c' \geq d'$, hence (1) and (2) follow by (0) and by Table 3.3 (d).
The cases (3) and (4) follow easily by Tables 3.3 (d) and (c).
(5) We have $s_m \leq 2d'$ by (0); further $2d'$ cannot satisfy the first two rows of 3.3 (c) since $\widetilde{s} < 2d' - d$. By a direct computation we can see that we always have $\gamma(2d' - j) \leq 1$, for $j \leq 2$, while for

$j = 3,4 \quad \gamma(2d'-j) \le 1 \Longleftrightarrow \{d'-j,...,d'-1\} \cap S \ne \{d'-j+1\}$. Now (a) and (b) follow because $\nu(\widetilde{s}+d) > \nu(\widetilde{s}+d+1)$ by Tables 3.3.(b) and (c). ◇

The following conjecture gives a lower bound for s_m, it is justified by calculations in very many examples. We are able to prove that it holds in many cases.

Conjecture 3.5 *For every semigroup the inequality* $s_m \ge c+d-e$ *holds.*

First we note that (3.5) holds in the following general cases:

Proposition 3.6 *Assume* $\left[\begin{array}{lll} \textit{either} & s_m \ge \widetilde{s}+d & \\ \textit{or} & s_m \ge 2d' & \textit{and} \ \ \widetilde{s} < d' \end{array}\right.$ *then* $s_m \ge c+d-e$.

In particular if either $\widetilde{s}+d \ge c'+d'$ *or* $\widetilde{s}+d = 2d'$, *then* $s_m \ge c+d-e$.

Proof. The first part follows by (2.6.2) and (2.6.3). In fact we have
(1) $\widetilde{s} \ge c-e$;
(2) in case $\widetilde{s} < d'$, $s_m \ge 2d'$, we have $d' \ge c-e+\ell$ (2.6.1b) and $d-d' \le \ell$ (2.7.1). Hence $s_m \ge 2d' \ge d'+c-e+\ell \ge c+d-e$. Now the particular cases follow by (3.4. 1...4). ◇

Corollary 3.7 (1) *If* $s_m > 2d'$, *then* $s_m - d \in S$.

(2) *If* $\widetilde{s} = d'-1$, *then* $s_m = \widetilde{s}+d \Longleftrightarrow c' \ne d$.

Proof.(1) follows by (3.4.1) and by Table 3.3.(d).
(2) If $c' = d$, then $s_m \ne \widetilde{s}+d$, by (3.4.2).
If $c' \ne d$ and $\widetilde{s} = d'-1$, we have $\widetilde{s} \ge d'+c'-d$ then apply (3.4.1). ◇

Proposition 3.8 *Assume* $\widetilde{s} \le d'-2$ *and* $[\widetilde{s}+2, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$. *Then* $s_m \le \widetilde{s}+d$:

(1) *if* $2d'-d < \widetilde{s} < d'+c'-d$, *then* $s_m \left[\begin{array}{l} = \widetilde{s}+d \Longleftrightarrow \widetilde{s}+1 \notin S \ \textit{and} \ c' = d \\ \le \widetilde{s}+d-1, \quad \textit{otherwise.} \end{array}\right.$

(2) *if* $\widetilde{s} \le 2d'-d$, *then* $s_m = \widetilde{s}+d$.

Proof. In case (1), by applying Theorem 3.4 we see that $s_m \le \widetilde{s}+d$; further $s_m = \widetilde{s}+d \Longleftrightarrow \widetilde{s}+d+1-c' \notin S$. Since $\widetilde{s}+1 \le \widetilde{s}+d+1-c' \le d'$ by the assumptions, we see that $s_m = \widetilde{s}+d \Longleftrightarrow c' = d$ and $\widetilde{s}+1 \notin S$.
In case (2), by Theorem 3.4 we have $s_m \le 2d'$.
Now let $\widetilde{s}+d+1 \le s \le 2d'$. Then by the assumptions we get

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \widetilde{s}+2 \le s+1-c' \le s-d'-1 < d' \\ s+1 \in S \ \text{ and } \ s+1-c' \in S' \\ \{s-d',...,d'\} \subseteq S \ \text{ (hence } \gamma(s) = -1 \text{ (3.3.2))} \\ s-\ell-d \in S \ \text{ (by (2.4.1)).} \end{array}\right.$$

From Tables 3.3 $(b)-(c)$ we conclude that $s_m < s$ and also that $s_m = \widetilde{s}+d$; in fact $\widetilde{s} \in S$, $\widetilde{s}+d+1-c' \in S'$, $\widetilde{s}-\ell \notin S$, further $\widetilde{s}+d-d' \ge \widetilde{s}+2$, because $d-d' \ge 2$, therefore $\gamma(\widetilde{s}+d) = -1$ by the assumptions and (3.3.2). ◇

Remark 3.9 (1) Both situations of (3.8.1) above can happen, even for $\ell = 3$ (see the following (4.7)):
(A) If $\ell = 3$, $t = 5$, $d' = d-3$, $c' = d-1$, (4.7.case A) we have $s_m < \widetilde{s}+d$.
(B) If $\ell = 3$, $t = 5$, $d' = d-3$, $d-4 \notin S$, $c' = d$, (4.7.case B) we have $s_m = \widetilde{s}+d$.

(2) Assume $2d'-d < \widetilde{s} \le d'+c'-d-1$ and $[d'-\ell+2, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$; then the set U of (3.4.3) is empty. In fact for each $s \in S$, such that $2d'+1 \le s \le \widetilde{s}+d$, we have $s+1 \in S$, and by (2.7.3(a)), $d'-\ell+2 \le 2d'+2-d \le s+1-c' \le d'$, therefore $s+1-c' \in S'$.

(3) If $s_m < 2d' \le \widetilde{s}+d$, then $\left\{\begin{array}{l} (a) \ \widetilde{s}+d+1-c' \in S \\ (b) \ \widetilde{s}+d+1-c'-\ell \in S \\ (c) \ \{2d'-d-\ell, 2d'+1-c'\} \cap S \ne \emptyset. \end{array}\right.$

(3.a) holds by (3.4.3); in fact the assumptions imply $U=\emptyset$ because $\widetilde{s}-\ell\notin S$.
(3.b) is clear by (3.a) and by (2.4.1) , since $\widetilde{s}<\widetilde{s}+d+1-c'<d$.
(3.c) follows by Table 3.3 (c)).

(4) The assumption $s_m>2d'$ in (3.7.1) is necessary: for instance if $S=\{0,20_e,21,26,27_{d'},32_d,39_c\rightarrow\}$ we have $s_m=2d'$, with $2d'-d\notin S$ (we deduce $s_m=2d'$ by Table 3.3 (c)).

Proposition 3.10 *If* $\widetilde{s}<d'$ *and* $[d'-\ell,d']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$, *let* $h=d-c'$, $q=d-d'$ *be as in* (2.1) *and let* $\sigma:=max\{s\in S,s<\widetilde{s}-\ell\}$. *Then*

(1) $[\widetilde{s}-\ell+1,d']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$ *and* $e\geq 2\ell+t$.

(2) *If* $2d'-d<\widetilde{s}\leq d'+c'-d-1$, *we have*

- (a) $q+h+1\leq t<2q\ (\leq 2\ell)$,
- (b) *For* $s\in[\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+1,2d']\cap S$, *we have* $\gamma(s)=-1$.
- (c) *If* $2d'-\ell-d\in S$, *then* $\sigma\geq 2d'-\ell-d$ *and* $\gamma(\sigma+d)=-1$.
- (d) *We have* $s_m\leq 2d'$.
- (e) *Let* $W:=[\widetilde{s}-2\ell+1,2d'-\ell-d]\cap\mathbb{N}\setminus S$.
  If $W\neq\emptyset$, *let* $h_0:=max\ W$, *then* $s_m\geq h_0+\ell+d$.
- (f) $s_m<\widetilde{s}+d-\ell+1\iff[\widetilde{s}-2\ell+1,2d'-d-\ell]\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$,
  $s_m<\widetilde{s}+d-\ell+1\implies e\geq 3\ell+t$.
- (g) *If* $[\widetilde{s}-2\ell+1,2d'-d-\ell]\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$, *then* $s_m\geq\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+1$.

Proof. (1) By the assumptions and by (2.4.1) we have $[\widetilde{s}-\ell+1,d']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$; the inequality $e\geq 2\ell+t$ follows by (2.6.3)
(2) Statement (a) is immediate by the assumption $2d'-d<\widetilde{s}\leq d'+c'-d-1$.
(b) follows by (1) and by (3.3.2).
(c) By assumption $2d'-\ell-d\in S$, further $2d'-d<\widetilde{s}$; then $2d'-\ell-d<\widetilde{s}-\ell$, hence $\sigma\geq 2d'-\ell-d$. Moreover $\widetilde{s}-\ell+1\leq d'-\ell=2d'-\ell-d'\leq\sigma+d-d'<(d-\ell)+\widetilde{s}-d'<2d'-d'=d'$; then apply ($b$) .
(d) By (3.4.3) we know that $s_m\leq\widetilde{s}+d$. For each $2d'<s\leq\widetilde{s}+d$ we have $d'-\ell<2d'+1-c'\leq s+1-c'\leq\widetilde{s}+d+1-c'\leq d'+c'-1+1-c'=d'$. Therefore $s+1-c'\in S$ and $s_m\leq 2d'$ by (3.4.3b).
(e) and (f). Note that $s\in[\widetilde{s}+d-\ell+1,2d']\cap S\implies\widetilde{s}-\ell+1\leq s-d\leq s+1-c'\leq s-d'\leq d'$, hence $\{s-d,\ s+1-c'\}\subseteq S'$ and $\gamma(s)=-1$, by (b) and the assumptions. By Table 3.3 (b) we get

$$\nu(s)>\nu(s+1)\iff s+1-c\notin S.$$

Then (e) follows and the equivalence (f) becomes immediate by (d), (e), recalling that $s+1-c=s-\ell-d$. We get $e\geq 3\ell+t$ by (2.6.1–2), since $d-(2\ell+t-1)\in S$ and $2\ell+t-1<e$ by (a).
(g) For $s\in[\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+1,2d'-\ell]\cap\mathbb{N}$, we have $\gamma(s)=-1$ (see (b)). If there exists $\overline{s}\in[\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+1,2d'-\ell]\cap\mathbb{N}$, $\overline{s}+1-c'\notin S$, we have $\overline{s}-d\in S'$ and we have $s_m\geq\overline{s}$ by Table 3.3 (b) (in fact $\overline{s}-d\in S'$ by the assumptions); the claim follows.
Assume on the contrary that $[\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+2-c',2d'-\ell+1-c']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$: then

$$[\widetilde{s}-2\ell+1,2d'-\ell+1-c']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S.$$

In fact $q+h+1\leq t$ (3.10.1) $\implies\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+2-c'=d-q-\ell-t+2+h\leq d-2q-\ell+1=2d'-\ell+1-d$. We can iterate the algorithm looking for one element $\overline{\overline{s}}\in[2d'-\ell+1,2d'-\ell+d+1-c']\cap\mathbb{N}$ such that $\overline{\overline{s}}+1-c'\notin S$. If needed we repeat the argument till we find s' such that $s'+1-c'\notin S$: s' surely exists since $\widetilde{s}-\ell\notin S$. $\diamond$

The previous results can be summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.11 *Assume* $[d'-\ell,d']\cap\mathbb{N}\subseteq S$. *Then* $s_m\geq c+d-e$. *In particular:*

(1) *if* $2d'-d<\widetilde{s}<d'+c'-d$, *we have* $c+d-e\leq\widetilde{s}+d'-\ell+1\leq s_m\leq 2d'$,

(2) $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ *in the remaining cases.*

Proof. (1) Since $\widetilde{s} < d'$, we have $[\widetilde{s} - \ell + 1, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$, $e \geq 2\ell + t$ by (3.10.1). It follows that $\widetilde{s} - \ell + 1 \geq c - e$ because $[c - \ell - e, c - e - 1] \cap S = \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{s} \geq c - e$ by (2.6.2).
The inequalities follow by items $(d), (e), (f), (g)$ of (3.10):
if the set W of (3.10.2e) is not empty then we see that $s_m \geq \widetilde{s} + d - \ell + 1 \geq \widetilde{s} + d' - \ell + 3$ by (3.10.2e), recalling that $d' \leq d - 2$.
If $W = \emptyset$, by (3.10.2g) we get $s_m \geq \widetilde{s} + d' - \ell + 1$.
(2) follows by (3.4.1) and by (3.8.2). In this case $s_m \geq c + d - e$ by (3.6).
To prove $s_m \geq c + d - e$ in case (1), first assume that $W = \emptyset$: since $d' \geq d - \ell$ (2.8.1) and $e \geq 3\ell + t$ (3.10.6), we get $s_m \geq \widetilde{s} - \ell + d' + 1 \geq \widetilde{s} - \ell + d - \ell + 1 = c + d - 3\ell - t \geq c + d - e.$
If $W \neq \emptyset$, since $e \geq 2\ell + t$ we get

$$s_m \geq \widetilde{s} + d - \ell + 1 = c + d - 2\ell - t \geq c + d - e,$$

further $d > d' + 1 \Longrightarrow \widetilde{s} + d - \ell + 1 > \widetilde{s} + d' - \ell + 1.$ ◇

In Case (g) of (3.10) we can give more precise evaluations of s_m.

Corollary 3.12 *Let* $[\widetilde{s} - 2\ell + 1, 2d' - d - \ell] \cup [d' - \ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$, *let* $2d' - d < \widetilde{s} < d' + c' - d$ *and let* σ *be as in (3.10) .*

$$(1)\ \textit{Assume} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{either} & c' - \ell - t - 1 \in S \\ \textit{or} & \left\{\begin{array}{l} c' - \ell - t - 1 \notin S \\ c' - 2\ell - t - 1 \notin S \end{array}\right. \end{array}\right. ,\ \textit{then}\ \ s_m \geq \widetilde{s} + c' - \ell - 1$$

$$(2)\ \textit{Assume} \left\{\begin{array}{l} c' - \ell - t - 1 \notin S \\ c' - 2\ell - t - 1 \in S \end{array}\right. ,\ \textit{then:}$$

(a) *If* $\sigma \leq c' - \ell - t - 2$, *then* $s_m \geq \sigma + d$.

$$(b)\ \textit{If} \left\{\begin{array}{l} \sigma \geq c' - \ell - t \\ \sigma - \ell \notin S \end{array}\right. ,\ \textit{then}\ \ s_m = \sigma + d.$$

$$(c)\ \textit{If} \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \multicolumn{2}{l}{\sigma \geq c' - \ell - t,\ \sigma - \ell \in S\ \ \textit{and}} \\ \textit{either} & 2d' - 2\ell - d \notin S \\ \quad\textit{or} & 2d' - \ell + 1 - c' \notin S \end{array}\right. ,\ \textit{then}\ \ s_m \geq 2d' - \ell.$$

Proof. (1) Let $s = \widetilde{s} + c' - \ell - 1$. Then $\widetilde{s} + d' - \ell + 1 \leq s \leq d' + \widetilde{s} - 1 < 2d'$ and so $\gamma(s) = -1$ (3.10.2b). Further $s + 1 - c' \notin S$ and, by the assumptions, either $s - d \in S'$ or ($s - d \notin S'$ and $s + 1 - c \notin S'$). The claim follows by Table 3.3 (b).
(2.a) From Table 3.3 (b) we get $\nu(\sigma + d) > \nu(\sigma + d + 1)$. In fact we have $\sigma < \sigma + d + 1 - c' \leq \widetilde{s} + c' - \ell - 2 + 1 - c' = \widetilde{s} - \ell - 1$. Hence $\sigma + d + 1 - c' \notin S$. Further $\gamma(\sigma + d) = -1$ by the assumption $2d' - d - \ell \in S$ and by (3.10.2c).
(2.b) In this case for each s such that $\sigma + d \leq s \leq \widetilde{s} + d - \ell$ we have $s + 1 - c' \in S$: in fact $\widetilde{s} - \ell + 1 \leq \sigma + d + 1 - c' \leq s + 1 - c' < 2d' - c' < d'$ (3.10.2a). Moreover we get $\gamma(s) = -1$ by (3.10.2b). If $s > \sigma + d$, then $s - d \notin S$ hence by Table 3.3 (b): $\nu(s) < \nu(s + 1)$ therefore $s_m \leq \sigma + d$ and $\nu(\sigma + d) > \nu(\sigma + d + 1) \Longleftrightarrow \sigma - \ell \notin S$.
(2.c). Since $d' > \widetilde{s}$ we have $\gamma(2d' - \ell) = -1$; in fact $2d' - \ell \geq \widetilde{s} + d' - \ell + 1$ (3.10.2b). Then the claim follows by using the assumption $2d' - \ell - d \in S$ and Table 3.3 (b). ◇

4 Some particular case.

In this section we shall estimate or give exactly the value of s_m in some particular case. Since $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ for each semigroup S satisfying $\widetilde{s} \geq c' + d' - d$, in this section we shall often assume $\widetilde{s} < c' + d' - d$.

4.1 Relations between the order bound and the holes set H.

Let $H := [c-e, c'] \cap \mathbb{N} \setminus S$ be as in (2.1): when H is an interval we deduce the value of s_m, if $\#H \leq 2$ and in some other situation we give a lower bound for s_m.

Proposition 4.1 (1) *If* $H = \emptyset$, *then* $c' = c - e$ *and* S *is acute with* $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$.

(2) *Assume that* $\widetilde{s} < d'$. *Then the conditions*

- (a) $[d' - \ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$ *and* $e = 2\ell + t$.
- (b) $H = [d' + 1, c' - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}$.

are equivalent and imply: $s_m = \left[\begin{array}{ll} 2d' & if \ \ 2d' - d + 1 \leq \widetilde{s} \leq d' + c' - d - 1 \\ \widetilde{s} + d & in\ the\ remaining\ cases. \end{array} \right.$

Proof. (1) $H = \emptyset \iff c' = c - e$; then apply (2.3. 5 and 4).
(2), $(a) \iff (b)$. (a) implies that $[\widetilde{s} - \ell + 1, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$, and $\widetilde{s} - \ell = c - e - 1$ (3.10.1) and (2.6.4). Hence ((b)) holds. On the contrary, (b) implies $[c - e, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$. Since $c - e \leq d' - \ell$ by (2.6.3), we get $[d' - \ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$, further $e \leq 2\ell + t$ by (2.8.2b). By assumption we also have $\widetilde{s} + 1 \in S$, hence $e \geq 2\ell + t$ by (2.6.3); then (a) follows.

When $2d' - d < \widetilde{s} < d' + c' - d$, by (2.6.1) $c - e \leq d' - \ell$, and so (2.7.1) we have $c - e - \ell \leq d' - \ell - (d - d') = 2d' - \ell - d < \widetilde{s} - \ell \leq c - e - 1$. We obtain $s_m \geq 2d'$ by (3.10.2e) because the set W as in (3.10.2e) has $2d' - \ell - d = max\ W$. Now $s_m = 2d'$ follows by (3.10.2d). For the statement in the remaining cases see (3.11.2). $\diamond$

Example 4.2 When $\widetilde{s} > d'$ the implication $(b) \Longrightarrow (a)$ in (4.1.2) is not true in general: in fact $S := \{0, 8_e, 12_{c-e=d'}, 14_{c'}, 15, 16_d ***20_c \rightarrow\}$ has $H = \{c' - 1\} = \{13\}$, $t = 0$, $\ell = 3$, $e \neq 2\ell + t$.

Proposition 4.3 *Assume* $\widetilde{s} < c' + d' - d$. *Let* $k := min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid d' - n \notin S\}$, $h := d - c'$, $s := d' + c' - k - 1$. *We have*

(1) $s \leq 2d' \iff c' - d' \leq k + 1 \iff d - d' \leq k + h + 1$.

(2) *If* $\widetilde{s} < d' - k$ *and* $\ell \leq k + h + 1$, *then* $s_m \geq s \geq c + d - e$.

(3) *If* $1 \leq k < \ell$, $c' - d' \leq k + 1$ *and* $\{d' - \ell, ..., d'\} \setminus \{d' - k\} \subseteq S$, *then* $c + d - e \leq s \leq s_m \leq 2d'$.

Proof. (1) is obvious by the assumptions.
(2) We have $[d' - k - \ell + 1, d' - \ell] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$ (2.4.1). Further by (3.1.2) we have $\gamma(s) = -1$; in fact the assumption $\ell \leq k + h + 1$ implies $c' - d' = d - d' - h \leq \ell - h \leq k + 1$, and so $s \leq 2d'$; since $[s - d', d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$, then $\gamma(s) = -1$ (3.1.2). Since $\widetilde{s} < d'$, then $d - c' \leq \ell - 2$, further $\ell \leq k + h + 1$; therefore

$$d' - k - \ell + 1 \leq s - d = d' + c' - k - 1 - d \leq d' - \ell.$$

Hence $s - d \in S$. Moreover $s + 1 - c' = d' - k \notin S$. Then $s_m \geq s$ by Table 3.3 (b).
To prove that $s \geq c + d - e$, recall that $c' - d' \leq k + 1$. Then by assumption we have $\widetilde{s} < d' - k < c' - k - 1 \leq d'$. Then $c' - k - 1 \in S$ and by (2.6.3) we get $c' - k - 1 \geq c - e + \ell$. Hence

$$s = d' + c' - k - 1 \geq d - \ell + c' - k - 1 \geq c + d - e \ (2.7.3a)$$

(3) By assumption $\widetilde{s} < d' - h \leq d'$, and so $[d' - h - \ell, d' - \ell] \cap \mathbb{N} \setminus \{d' - k - \ell\} \subseteq S$. Hence $[d' - h - \ell, d' - k - 1] \cap \mathbb{N} \setminus \{d' - k - \ell\} \subseteq S$. Now recalling that $k < \ell$ we get:

$$d' - h - \ell \leq s - d < d' - k - h \leq d' - k.$$

Hence $s - d \in S$: in fact $s - d \neq d' - k - \ell$ because $s - d \geq d' - k - \ell + 1$. Further $s + 1 - c' \notin S$ and $\gamma(s) = -1$ by (3.1.2) since $s \leq 2d'$ and $\{s - d', ..., d'\} \subseteq S$. Then $s \leq s_m$ by Table 3.3 (b). The inequality $s \geq c + d - e$ can be proved as in (2). For each element $2d' < u < c' + d'$ we have $d' \geq u + 1 - c' > s + 1 - c' = d' - k$; hence $u + 1 - c' \in S'$ then $\nu(u + 1) \geq \nu(u)$ by Table 3.3 (d).

Corollary 4.4 *Suppose* $\widetilde{s} < c' + d' - d$ *and* $\#H \leq 2$. *Then* $s_m \geq c + d - e$.

Proof. If $\#H = 0$, we have $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ and we are done by (4.1.1) and (3.6).
If ($\#H = 2$ and $H = \{d'+1, c'-1\}$), or $\#H = 1$, then either $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$, or $s_m = 2d'$ (4.1.2); now see (3.6).
Finally assume that $H = \{d' - k\} \cup \{d' + 1\}$, with $k \geq 1$. In this case we have $c' - d' = 2 \leq k + 1$, since $k \geq 1$. Hence the claim $s_m \geq c + d - e$ follows by (3.11), if $k > \ell$, and by (4.3.3) if $k < \ell$. ⋄

4.2 Case $\ell = 2$.

If $\ell = 2$, the conjecture (3.5) is true, more precisely by [6, Thm 5.5] we have:

Proposition 4.5 *Assume* $\ell = 2$, *then* $s_m \geq c + d - e$ *and*

$$(1)\ \ s_m = \widetilde{s} + d \ \ \textit{if} \left[\begin{array}{l} t \leq 2, \\ t = 4 \\ t \geq 5 \ \ \textit{and} \ \ d - 3 \in S. \end{array}\right.$$

$$(2)\ \ s_m = 2d - 4 \ \ \textit{if} \left[\begin{array}{lll} \textit{either} & t = 3 \ \ \textit{and} & d - 6 \notin S \\ \textit{or} & t \geq 5 \ \ \textit{and} & d - 3 \notin S. \end{array}\right.$$

(3) $s_m = 2d - 6$ *if* $t = 3$ *and* $d - 6 \in S$ (*all the remaining cases*).

Proof. The value of s_m is known by [6, Thm. 5.5]. Another proof can be easily deduced by (2.4.1), (3.4.2), (4.3.3), (3.8.2), Table 3.3 (d), (3.10. e, g). The inequalities $s_m \geq c + d - e$ now follow respectively by (3.6) and by (3.11.3). ⋄

4.3 Case $\ell = 3$.

If $\ell = 3$, we compute explicitly the possible values of s_m and we show that the conjecture (3.5) holds.

Notation 4.6 (1) If $s_i = 2d - k \in S$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$M(s_i) := \{(s_h, s_j) \in S^2 \mid s_i = s_h + s_j, s_h \leq d, s_j \leq d\}.$$

Note that $M(s_i) = \{(d - x, d - y) \in S^2, \mid 0 \leq x, y \leq k,\ x + y = k\}$ and that for $s_i \geq c$, we have $s_{i+1} - c = d - \ell - k$; for short it will be convenient to use the following notation.

$$(*) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Sigma := \{z \in \mathbb{N}, \mid z \leq d,\ d - z \in S\} \\ (c, h) \in S \times \Sigma,\ h = d + c - s_i \text{ instead of the pair } (c, s_i - c) \in N(s_i). \end{array} \right.$$

If $\ell = 3$, then $e \geq t + \ell + 1 = t + 4$ (2.6.2). To calculate the value of s_m, we shall assume $\widetilde{s} < c' + d' - d$, otherwise $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ by (3.4.1). Then we have $t \geq 3$, $d - 3 \in S$ and $d - 3 \leq d'$, by (2.5.2) and by (2.7.3a). Three cases are possible:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \textit{Case } A: & S = \{0, e, ..., d-3, *, d-1, d, ***, c = d+4 \rightarrow\} & d' = d - 3 \\ \textit{Case } B: & S = \{0, e, ..., d-3, *\ \ *, d, ***, c = d+4 \rightarrow\} & d' = d - 3 \\ \textit{Case } C: & S = \{0, e, ..., d-3, d-2, *, d, ***, c = d+4 \rightarrow\} & d' = d - 2. \end{array}$$

To describe $M(2d - k)$ we shall use the notations $(*)$ fixed in (4.6) and forwhen necessary for an element $2d - k$ we shall list all the pairs $(x, y) \in M'(2d - k)$ and the pair $(c, \ell + k + 1) \in S \times \Sigma$ (the pairs underlined $\underline{(\ ,\ )}$ not necessarily belong to Σ^2).

Proposition 4.7 *Assume* $\ell = 3$. *Then* $s_m \geq c + d - e$. *More precisely the values of* s_m *can be computed as follows.*

Case A. We have: $$s_m = \left[\begin{array}{lll} \widetilde{s}+d & if & either\ t \in [0,7]\setminus\{5\}\ \ or\ \ (t \geq 8, d-5 \in S) \\ 2d-7 & if & t \geq 8,\ d-5 \notin S \\ & if & t=5: \\ 2d-6 & if & d-9 \notin S \\ 2d-7 & if & d-9 \in S, d-10 \notin S \\ 2d-9 & if & \{d-9, d-10\} \subseteq S,\ d-12 \notin S \\ 2d-10 & if & \{d-9, d-10, d-12\} \subseteq S \end{array} \right.$$

Proof. $S = \{0, e, ..., d-3, *, d-1, d, ***, c = d+4 \rightarrow\}$, with $e \geq \ell + t + 1 = t+4$ (2.6.1).
First we have $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ if $t \leq 2d - c' - d' = 4$ and $s_m < \widetilde{s} + d$, if $t = 5$ by (3.4.1 and 2). Hence we can assume $t \geq 5$, so that $d-4 = d-1-\ell \in S$, $d-3-\ell = d-6 \in S$, i.e., $\{0,1,3,4,6\} \subseteq \Sigma$.

If $t = 5$ we have $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$ and $2d' = 2d-6 < \widetilde{s} + d = d' + c' - 1$. We obtain that $2d - 10 \leq s_m \leq 2d'$, $e \geq 2\ell + t$ and $s_m \geq c + d - e$ by (3.11). More precisely we can verify that:
$$s_m = \left[\begin{array}{lll} 2d-6 & if\ 9 \notin \Sigma & s_m = 2d' \geq c+d-e \\ 2d-7 & if\ 9 \in \Sigma\ and\ 10 \notin \Sigma & s_m = c+d-11 \geq c+d-e \\ 2d-9 & if\ 9 \in \Sigma,\ 10 \in \Sigma, 12 \notin \Sigma & s_m = c+d-13 \geq c+d-e \\ & & in\ fact\ 10 \in \Sigma \Longrightarrow e \geq 14 \\ 2d-10 & if \{9,10,12\} \subseteq \Sigma & s_m \geq c+d-e. \end{array} \right.$$
Note that in this case we have $d + d' - \ell - t + 1 = 2d - 2\ell - t + 1 = 2d - 10$ and this bound is achieved if $\{9, 10, 12\} \subseteq \Sigma$ (with $e \geq 16$). See, e.g. $S = \{0, 16, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40_{\widetilde{s}}, 41, 42, 43_{d'}, 45, 46_d, 50_c \rightarrow\}$.

If $t \geq 6$ we have $\widetilde{s} \leq 2d' - d$ and we consider the following subcases.

If $t = 6$, then $\widetilde{s} = 2d' - d = s_m$ by (3.4.4).

If $t \geq 7$ and $5 \in \Sigma$, one has $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$ and $\widetilde{s} < 2d' - d$, hence $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$, by (3.11).

If $t \geq 7$ and $5 \notin \Sigma$, we know that $s_m \leq 2d'$ by (3.4.5); one can compute directly that
$$\nu(2d') < \nu(2d'+1) \text{ (see Table 3.3 (c)) and that } \nu(2d-7) > \nu(2d-6),$$
hence $s_m = 2d - 7 = 2d' - 1$. Since $d - 6 = d' - \ell \in S$, we get $e \geq 2\ell + 1 + 6 = 13$ (2.6.3), and so $s_m \geq c + d - e + 2$.

Case B. We have: $$\left[\begin{array}{ll} Case\ \ t \leq 3: & s_m = \widetilde{s}+d \\ Case\ \ t \geq 4,\ d-5 \notin S: & s_m = 2d-6 \\ Case\ \ t \geq 4,\ d-5 \in S, d-4 \in S: & \\ \quad if\ \ t \in \{4,5\}, & s_m \in [2d-9, 2d-6] \\ \quad if\ \ t \geq 6, & s_m\ = \widetilde{s}+d \\ Case\ \ t \geq 5,\ d-5 \in S,\ d-4 \notin S: & \\ \quad if\ \ t \in \{5,6,8\}, & s_m\ = \widetilde{s}+d \\ \quad if\ \ t = 7, & s_m \in \{2d-8, 2d-11\} \\ \quad if\ \ t \geq 9,\ \ d-7 \notin S, & s_m = 2d-8 \\ \quad if\ \ t = 9,\ \ d-7 \in S, & s_m \in \{2d-10, 2d-11, 2d-13\} \\ \quad if\ \ t \geq 10,\ d-7 \in S, & s_m = \widetilde{s}+d. \end{array} \right.$$

Proof. $S = \{0, e, ..., d-3, *\ \ *, d, ***, c = d+4 \rightarrow\}$, $e \geq t+4$.
As in case A we can see that $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ if $t \leq 3$ and $s_m < \widetilde{s} + d$ for $t = 4$. Suppose $t \geq 4$. Then $\{0, 3, 6\} \subseteq \Sigma$. We deduce the statement by means of the following table:

$$\left[\begin{array}{lll} 2d-3 & (0,3) & \\ 2d-4 & \underline{(0,4)} & \underline{(c,8)} \\ 2d-5 & \underline{(0,5)} & \underline{(c,9)} \\ 2d-6 & (0,6)(3,3) & \underline{(c,10).} \end{array} \right.$$

If $4 \in \Sigma$, $5 \in \Sigma$, we have $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$ and by applying (3.11) we get $s_m \geq c + d - e$. More precisely, one can easily verify that for $t \in \{4, 5\}$ we have $2d - 9 \leq s_m \leq 2d - 6$, for $t \geq 6$ we have $\widetilde{s} \leq 2d' - d$, then by (2.4.1) and by (3.8.2) we get $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$.

If $5 \notin \Sigma$, we have $s_m = 2d - 6$.

If $4\notin\Sigma,\ 5\in\Sigma$:

we have $s_m = \left[\begin{array}{lll} 2d-5 & \iff & t=5 \\ 2d-6 & \iff & t=6\ (8\in\Sigma,\ 9\notin\Sigma); \end{array}\right.$

the remaining cases to consider satisfy $\{0,3,5,6,8,9\}\subseteq\Sigma, 4\notin\Sigma$, with $t\geq 7,\ \ s_m<2d-6$:

$$\left[\begin{array}{llll}
2d-7 & \underline{(0,7)} & \underline{(c,11)} & \\
2d-8 & (0,8)(3,5) & \underline{(c,12)} & s_m=2d-8 \iff \left[\begin{array}{l} 7\notin\Sigma\ \ or \\ 7\in\Sigma, 11\notin\Sigma\ (\implies 7\leq t\leq 8)\end{array}\right. \\
 & \mathit{otherwise}\ \ 7,11\in\Sigma: & \{0,3,5,6,7,8,9,11\}\subseteq\Sigma, 4\notin\Sigma & \\
2d-9 & (0,9)(3,6) & \underline{(c,13)} & \\
2d-10 & \underline{(0,10)}(3,7)(5,5) & \underline{(c,14)} & s_m=2d-10 \iff 10\in\Sigma,\ 13\notin\Sigma(\implies 9\leq t\leq 10) \\
 & \mathit{otherwise} & \left[\begin{array}{lll} \mathit{either} & (\alpha) & 10,13\in\Sigma \\ \mathit{or} & (\beta) & 10\notin\Sigma\ (t=7)\end{array}\right. &
\end{array}\right.$$

Case (α): $\{0,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13\}\subseteq\Sigma, 4\notin\Sigma\ \ (\implies t\geq 9)$:

$$\left[\begin{array}{lll}
2d-10 & (0,10)(3,7)(5,5) & \underline{(c,14)} \\
2d-11 & (0,11)(3,8)(5,6) & \underline{(c,15)}\ \ s_m=2d-11 \iff 14\notin\Sigma \\
 & & (\implies t=9\ \mathit{if}\ 12\notin\Sigma,\ t=11\ \mathit{if}\ 12\in\Sigma) \\
 & \mathit{otherwise}\ \ 14\in\Sigma: & \{0,3,5\longleftrightarrow 11,13\}\subseteq\Sigma, 4\notin\Sigma \\
2d-12 & \underline{(0,12)}(3,9)(5,7)(6,6) & \underline{(c,16)}\ \ s_m=2d-12 \iff t=12 \\
 & \mathit{otherwise} & \left[\begin{array}{lll} \mathit{either} & (\alpha 1) & 12\notin\Sigma(\iff t=9) \\ \mathit{or} & (\alpha 2) & 12\in\Sigma,\ \ 15\in\Sigma\end{array}\right. \\
2d-13 & (0,13)(3,10)(5,8)(6,7) & \underline{(c,17)}\ \ s_m=2d-13 \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathit{in\ case}\ (\alpha 1) \\ \mathit{in\ case}\ (\alpha 2) \iff t=13\end{array}\right. \\
 & \mathit{otherwise}\ 16\in\Sigma & \{0,3,5\longleftrightarrow 16\}\subseteq\Sigma\ 4\notin\Sigma: \\
2d-14 & (0,14)(3,11)(5,9)(6,8)(7,7) & \underline{(c,18)}\ \ s_m=2d-14 \iff t=14 \\
 & \mathit{otherwise}\ 17\in\Sigma, & \{0,3,5\longleftrightarrow 15,16,17\}\subseteq\Sigma,\ \ 4\notin\Sigma...
\end{array}\right.$$

Clearly in cases $(\alpha 2)$, for each $t\geq 13$ we get $s_m=\widetilde{s}+d$.

Case (β): $\{0,3,5,6,7,8,9,11,\}\subseteq\Sigma,\ 4,10\notin\Sigma\ (t=7)$:

$$\left[\ 2d-11 \quad (0,11)(3,8)(5,6) \quad \underline{(c,15)} \quad s_m=2d-11.\right.$$

Case C. We have: $s_m = \left[\begin{array}{lll}
 & if & t=3: \\
2d-4 & if & d-4\in S,\ d-7\notin S \\
2d-5 & if & (\{d-4,d-7\}\subseteq S,\ d-8\notin S)\ or\ (d-4\notin S) \\
2d-7 & if & \{d-4,d-7,d-8\}\subseteq S \\
 & if & t\geq 4: \\
\widetilde{s}+d & if & \ \ d-4\in S \\
2d-5 & if & \ \ d-4\notin S.
\end{array}\right.$

Proof. $S=\{0,e,...,d-3,d-2,*,d,***,c=d+4\rightarrow\}, d'=d-2$.
As above we see that $t\geq 3,\ \ d-3,d-5\in S$ (i.e. $\{0,2,3,5\}\subseteq\Sigma$), $e\geq 7$. Consider the table:

$$\left[\begin{array}{llllll}
2d-2 & (0,2) & & & & \\
2d-3 & (0,3) & \underline{(c,7)} & & & \\
2d-4 & \underline{(0,4)}(2,2) & \underline{(c,8)} & s_m= & 2d-4 & if\ 4\in\Sigma,7\notin\Sigma \\
2d-5 & (0,5)(2,3) & \underline{(c,9)} & s_m= & 2d-5 & if \left[\begin{array}{l} 4\notin\Sigma\ or \\ 4,7\in\Sigma,8\notin\Sigma.\end{array}\right. \\
if & \{4,7,8\}\subseteq\Sigma & & then & e\geq 12 & (d-8+e\geq c) \\
2d-6 & \underline{(0,6)}(2,4)(3,3) & \underline{(c,10)} & & & \\
2d-7 & \underline{(0,7)}(2,5)(3,4) & \underline{(c,11)} & & &
\end{array}\right.$$

If $t=3$, then $6\notin\Sigma$: we get $s_m=2d-7$.

If $t \geq 4$ and $4 \in \Sigma$, we have $[d' - \ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$ and $\widetilde{s} \leq 2d' - d$. Then $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d \geq c + d - e$ by (3.11).

If $4 \notin S$, by the above table we deduce that $s_m = 2d - 5$. $\diamond$

4.4 Semigroups with CM type $\tau \leq 7$.

As a consequence of the above results we obtain lower bounds or the exact value of s_m for semigroups with small Cohen-Maculay type. First, in the next lemma we collect well-known or easy relations among the CM type τ of S and the other invariants.

Lemma 4.8 *Let τ be the CM-type of the semigroup S as in* (2.1).

(1) $\#H + \ell \leq \tau \leq e - 1$

(2) *Assume $\tau = \ell$, then $H = \emptyset$ and the following conditions are equivalent:*

  - (a) $\ell = e - 1$
  - (b) $\tau = \ell,\ c' = d.$
  - (c) $d = c - e.$
  - (d) $S = \{0, e, 2e, ..., ke \rightarrow\}.$

(3) *If $c' > c - e$, then $\tau \geq \ell + 1$ and $\tau = \ell + 1 \Longrightarrow H = \{c' - 1\}$.*

(4) *Assume $\widetilde{s} \leq d'$ and $\tau = \ell + 1$. Then* $\left[\begin{array}{ll} e \in \{2\ell + t - 1, 2\ell + t\}, & if\ \ \widetilde{s} = d' \\ e = 2\ell + t, & if\ \ \widetilde{s} < d'. \end{array} \right.$

Proof. (1) Clearly every gap $h \geq c - e$ belongs to $S(1) \setminus S$, in particular $\{d+1, ..., d+\ell\} \cup H \subseteq S(1) \setminus S$. The inequality $\tau \leq e - 1$. is well-known.
(2) (3) are almost immediate.
(4). We have $\#H \leq 1$ by (1), $\widetilde{s} - \ell < \widetilde{s} \leq d' < c' - 1$. If $\#H = 0$, then $c' = c - e$ (4.1) and so $e = 2\ell + t$ (2.7.2). If $\#H = 1 \Longrightarrow \widetilde{s} - \ell \notin H$ and $d' = c' - 2$: it follows $e \leq 2\ell + t$ by (2.6.4). Now apply (2.6.3) and (2.8.2c): if $\widetilde{s} < d'$, then $\widetilde{s} + 1 \in S$, hence $e \geq 2\ell + t$ and so $e = 2\ell + t$. Further $\widetilde{s} = d' \Longrightarrow c' \geq c - e + \ell \Longrightarrow e \geq c - c' + \ell = d + 2\ell - d' - 1 = 2\ell + t - 1$.

Example 4.9 (1) We recall that in general $c' = c - e$ does not imply $\tau = \ell$. For instance, let $S = \{0, 10_{e=d'}, 16_{c-e}, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24_d, 26_c \rightarrow\}$. Then $\tau = 5 \neq \ell$.

(2) Analogously $H = \{c' - 1\}$ does not imply $\tau = \ell + 1$:
$S = \{0, 10_e, 16_{c-e}, 17, 18, 19, 20_{d'}, 22_{c'=d}, 26_c \rightarrow\}$ has $\ell = 3,\ \tau = 5$.

(3) In (4.8.4) the conditions $e = 2\ell + t$ and $\widetilde{s} < d'$ are not equivalent, further when $\widetilde{s} = d'$ both the cases with $\tau = \ell + 1,\ \widetilde{s} = d'$ are possible. For instance
$\{0, 9_{e=c-e}, 10, 11_{d'}, 13_{c'}, 14_d, 18_c \rightarrow\}$ has $t = \ell = 3,\ e = 2\ell + t,\ \widetilde{s} = d',\ \ \tau = \ell + 1;$
$\{0, 8_e, 9_{d'}, 11_{c'}, 12_d, 16_c \rightarrow\}$ has $t = \ell = 3,\ e = 2\ell + t - 1,\ \widetilde{s} = d',\ \ \tau = \ell + 1.$

(4) There exist semigroups with $H = \{c' - 1\}$, $\widetilde{s} < d'$, $\tau = \ell + 1$ as in (4.8.4):

$S = \{0 * ... * 11_e * * * 15_{d-e} * * * 19, 20, 21, 22, 23_{d'} * 25_{c'}\ 26_d * * * 30_c \rightarrow\}$,
has $\ell = 3,\ t = 5,\ e = 2\ell + t,\ \tau = 4$.

Now we deduce bounds for s_m when $\tau \leq 7$.

Proposition 4.10 *For each $\tau \leq 7$ we have $s_m \geq c + d - e$. More precisely when $\widetilde{s} < c' + d' - d$ we have the following results.*

(1) $\tau \leq 3$. We have: $s_m = \left[\begin{array}{ll} 2d - 4 & \text{if } S \text{ non-acute, } \tau = t = 3\ (\ell = 2) \\ \widetilde{s} + d & \text{in the other cases} \end{array} \right.$
[6, 5.9] [5, 4.13]

(2) $\tau = 4$. We have $\ell \leq 4$ and the following subcases.

If $\ell = 4 (= \tau)$, then $H = \emptyset$ (4.8.1), therefore S is acute with $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ (2.3.4).
If $\ell \leq 3$ we are done by the previous (4.5), (4.7), (2.3.4) and (4.1) (recall $\ell = 1 \Longrightarrow S$ is acute).
More precisely we get:

$$s_m = \left[\begin{array}{ll} 2d-4 & \textit{if} \left[\begin{array}{l} \ell = 2 \textit{ and either } (t=3,\ d-6 \notin S) \textit{ or } (t \geq 5,\ d-3 \notin S) \\ \ell = t = 3, e = 9,\ c' = d,\ d' = c'-2,\ d-4 \in S \end{array}\right. \\ & \\ 2d-6 & \textit{if} \left[\begin{array}{l} \ell = 2,\ t = 3, d-6 \in S \\ \ell = 3,\ t = 5,\ e = 11,\ c' = d-1, d' = c'-2 \end{array}\right. \\ & \\ \widetilde{s} + d & \textit{in the other cases.} \end{array}\right.$$

(3) $\tau = 5$. As above we know s_m in every case:

- (a) If $\ell \leq 3$ we can deduce s_m by (4.5), (4.7),
- (b) If $4 \leq \ell \leq 5$, then we are done by (4.1), since $\#H \leq 1$.

(4) $\tau = 6$. We can calculate s_m as follows:

- (a) If $\ell \leq 3$ as in (3.a).
- (b) If $5 \leq \ell \leq 6$, then we are done by (4.1), since $\#H \leq 1$.
- (c) If $\ell = 4$ and $H \subseteq \{c'-2, c'-1\}$, we have the value of s_m by (4.1) and (4.1.2).
- (d) If $\ell = 4$ and $H = \{d'-k, c'-1\}$, with $k \geq 1$, then $d' = c'-2$, and the bounds for s_m are given in (3.11) if $k > \ell$, and in (4.4) if $\ell > k \geq 1$ (in fact $c' - d' = 2 \leq k+1$).

(5) $\tau = 7$. We have $\ell \leq 7$ and the following subcases.

- (a) If $\ell \leq 3$, then s_m is known as in (3.a).
- (b) If $6 \leq \ell \leq 7$ then $\#H \leq 1$ and we are done by (4.1).
- (c) If $\ell = 5$, then $\#H \leq 2$ and we are done by (4.1), (4.4).
- (d) If $\ell = 4$, then $\#H \leq 3$ and we are done if $\#H \leq 2$ by (4.1), (4.4).
  If $\ell = 4$, $\#H = 3$, consider the following subcases
  - (i) $H = [d'+1, c'-1] \cap \mathbb{N}$: then s_m is given in (4.1).
  - (ii) $H = \{d'-k, c'-2, c'-1\}$, $k \geq 2$. If $k < \ell$, then s_m is given in (4.3.3). If $k \geq \ell$, apply (3.11).
  - (iii) $H = \{d'-1, c'-2, c'-1\}$: this case cannot exist. In fact since $S = \{e, \dots, d'-2, *, d', *, *, c', \dots, d, c \rightarrow\}$ and by the assumption $\widetilde{s} < d'$, we obtain $c' - \ell \in S$ and $c' - \ell = c' - 4 = d' - 1 \notin S$, impossible.
  - (iv) $H = \{d'-j, d'-k, c'-1\}$, $j > k \geq 1$, hence $S = \{e, \dots, d'-2, \dots, d', *, c', \dots, d (\leq c'+2), \dots, d+5 \rightarrow\}$, with $2 = c' - d' \leq k+1$. As in the proof of (4.3.2) for $s := d' - k + c' - 1$ we have $\gamma(s) = -1$, $s + 1 - c' \notin S$, $s - d \in S \Longleftrightarrow s - d \neq d' - j$. Hence (Table 3.3 (b)) $s_m \geq s$ if $s - d \neq d' - j$, i.e., $d' - k + c' - 1 - d \neq d' - j$, i.e., $d - c' \neq j - k - 1$.

$$\text{Four subcases: } \left[\begin{array}{lcl} j = k+1 & \Longrightarrow & s_m \geq s \ \ \textit{if} \ \ d \neq c' \\ j = k+2 & \Longrightarrow & s_m \geq s \ \ \textit{if} \ \ d \neq c'+1 \\ j = k+3 & \Longrightarrow & s_m \geq s \ \ \textit{if} \ \ d \neq c'+2 \\ j \geq k+4 & \Longrightarrow & s_m \geq s \\ & & (\text{since} \quad d - c' \leq \ell - 2 = 2,\ j - k - 1 \geq 3). \end{array}\right.$$

In the remaining three situations we can see that $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$, therefore s_m is given by (3.11):
- If $j = k+1$ and $d = c'$, since $\widetilde{s} < d'$, $\ell = 4$ we get $\{d'-4, d-4 = d'-2, d'\} \subseteq S$. Since there are two consecutive holes, then $k \geq 5$. It follows $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$.

- If $j = k+2$, and $d = c'+1$, we have $c'-4 = d'-2$, $d'-1 = d-4$ and $\widetilde{s} < d'-1$ (4.3.1) . Therefore $S = \{e, ..., d'-5, d'-4, d'-3, *, d'-2, d'-1, d', *, d'+2 = c', d'+3 = d, d+5 \rightarrow\}$. We deduce $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$.
- If $j = k+3$, and $d = c'+2$, analogously we deduce $[d'-\ell, d'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq S$. $\diamond$

4.5 The value of s_m for semigroups of multipicity $e \leq 8$.

Corollary 4.11 *For each semigroup S of multiplicity $e \leq 8$ we have $s_m \geq c+d-e$.*

Proof. Since $\tau \leq e-1$ the result follows by (4.10). $\diamond$

4.6 Almost arithmetic sequences and Suzuki curves.

Recall that a semigroup S is *generated by an almost arithmetic sequence* (shortly AAS) if

$$S = < m_0, m_1, ..., m_{p+1}\ , n >$$

with $m_0 \geq 2$, $m_i = m_0 + \rho\ i$, $\forall\ i = 1, ..., p+1$, *and* $GCD(\rho, m_0, n) = 1$. (The embedding dimension of S is *embdim* $S = p+2$).

Proposition 4.12 *Let S be an AAS semigroup of embedding dimension μ; then $\tau \leq 2(\mu-2)$.*

Proof. It is a consequence of [8, 3.3 - 4.6 - 4.7 - 5.6 - 5.7 - 5.8 - 5.9] after suitable calculations.

Corollary 4.13 *If S is an AAS semigroup with embdim $S \leq 5$ then $s_m \geq c+d-e$.*

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of (4.10) and (4.12). $\diamond$

As another corollary we obtain the value of s_m for the Weierstrass semigroup of a *Suzuki curve*, that is a plane curve C defined by the equation

$$y^b - y = x^a(x^b - x), \text{ with } a = 2^n,\ b = 2^{2n+1},\ n > 0.$$

Some applications of these curves to AG codes can be found for example in [4].

Proposition 4.14 *If S is the Weierstrass semigroup of a Suzuki Curve, then S is symmetric, therefore $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$.*

Proof. In [4, Lemma 3.1] is proved that the Weierstrass semigroup S at a rational place of the function field of C is generated as follows:

$$S = < b, b+a, b+\frac{b}{a}, 1+b+\frac{b}{a} >$$

We have $b = 2a^2$, with $a = 2^n$, hence $S = < 2a^2,\ 2a^2+a,\ 2a^2+2a,\ 2a^2+2a+1 >$ Then consider the semigroup

$$S = < 2a^2,\ 2a^2+a,\ 2a^2+2a,\ 2a^2+2a+1 >, \quad a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If $a = 1$, then $S = < 2, 3 >$.
If $a > 1$, then S is generated by an almost arithmetic sequence, and $embdim(S) = 4$; in fact

$$S = < m_0, m_1, m_2, n >, \quad \text{with } m_0 = 2a^2,\ m_1 = m_0 + a,\ m_2 = m_1 + a,\ n = m_2 + 1.$$

Since S is AAS, we shall compute the Apery set $\mathcal{A}$ by means of the algorithm described in [8]:
let $p = embdim(S) - 2 = 2$ and for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$,
let q_t, r_t be the (uniqe) integers such that $t = pq_t + r_t (= 2q_t + r_t)$, $q_t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $r_t \in \{1, 2\}$,
let $g_t = q_t m_2 + m_{r_t}$, i.e., $g_t = \left[\begin{array}{ll} (q_t+1)m_2 & if\ r_t = 2 \\ q_t m_2 + m_1 & if\ r_t = 1 \end{array} \right.$ (in particular $g_0 = 0$).

Then by [8] the Apery set $\mathcal{A}$ of S is: $\{\ g_t + hn \ \mid\ 0 \le t \le 2a-1,\ 0 \le h \le a-1\ \}$: therefore the elements of the Apery set are the $2a^2$ entries of the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix}
0 & g_1 & g_2 & g_3 & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & g_{2a-1} \\
 & || & || & || & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & || \\
 & m_1 & m_2 & m_1+m_2 & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & (a-1)m_2+m_1 \\
n & g_1+n & g_2+\ n & . & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & . \\
2n & g_1+2n & g_2+2n & . & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & . \\
. & . & . & . & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & . \\
. & . & . & . & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & . \\
(a-1)n & g_1+(a-1)n & g_2+(a-1)n & . & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot & g_{2a-1}+(a-1)n
\end{bmatrix}$$

Recall that a semigroup S of multiplicity e and Apery set $\mathcal{A}$ is *symmetric* $\Longleftrightarrow$ for each $s_i \in \mathcal{A},\ 0 < s_i \ne s_e := max\,\mathcal{A}$, there exists $s_j \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $s_i + s_j = s_e$.

In our case c this condition is satisfied: in fact $s_i = \left[\begin{array}{ll} \alpha m_2 + h\ n, & h \le a-1,\ \ \alpha \ge 1 \quad (1)\ \ \mathit{or} \\ \alpha\ m_2 + m_1 + h\ n & 0 \le \alpha,\ \ h \le a-1 \quad (2) \end{array}\right.$ further $s_e = (a-1)(m_2+n) + m_1$, and so

$$s_e - s_i = \left[\begin{array}{c} (a-1-\alpha)m_2 + m_1 + (a-1-h)\ n \in \mathcal{A} \quad (1)\ \ \mathit{or} \\ (a-1-\alpha)\ m_2 + (a-1-h)\ n \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2) \end{array}\right.$$

Since a semigroup S is symmetric if and only if its CM-type is one, then $s_m = \widetilde{s} + d$ by (4.10.1). $\diamond$

References

[1] M. Bras-Amoros, “Acute Semigroups, the Order Bound on the Minimum Distance, and the Feng-Rao Improvements”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp.1282-1289, (2004).

[2] G.L. Feng, T.R.N. Rao, “A simple approach for construction of algebraic-geometric codes from affine plane curves.”, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory,* vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 1003-1012, (1994).

[3] T. Høholdt, J.H. van Lint, R. Pellikaan, “Algebraic geometry of codes”, *Handbook of coding theory*, vol.1, pp. 871-961, Elsevier, Amsterdam, (1998).

[4] G.L. Matthews, “Codes from the Suzuki function field”, *IEEE Trans.Inform. Theory,* vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3298-3302, (2004).

[5] A. Oneto, G. Tamone “On Numerical Semigroups and the Order Bound”, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra.* Vol 212/10, pp. 2271-2283 (2008).

[6] A. Oneto, G. Tamone “On the order bound of one-point algebraic geometry codes ”, *JPAA*, Vol 213/6, pp. 1179-1191 (2009).

[7] C. Kirfel, R. Pellikaan, “The minimum distance of codes in an array coming from telescopic semigroups”, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory,* vol. 41, pp. 1720-1732, (1995).

[8] D. Patil, I. Sengupta, “Minimal set of generators for the derivation module of certain monomial curves”, *Comm. in Algebra*, vol. 27 no.1, pp. 5619-5631, (1999).